

REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on January 10, 2006. Claims 1-21 are standing for examination. In the Action, claims 1-21 are rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Mizumoto et al. of record, in view of Pascoe et al. also of record.

In the response to arguments section of the action the Examiner states that the applicant's argument that Mizumoto teaches only frequency division is not persuasive because the claimed limitation is "...frequency multiplication or division." The applicant has therefore amended the appropriate claims to recite only frequency multiplication, and the claimed limitation is not, by the Examiner's tacit admission, met by Mizumoto.

Therefore, the claims standing for examination are patentable over the art of record. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Bert L. Fransis

By /Donald R. Boys/
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
831-726-1457